

First, the language in H.J. Res. 20 say—on page 9—that hidden earmarks shall have no “legal effect,” but it does not clearly state that hidden earmarks shall have no guiding effect. These earmarks already have no legal effect. The point of this section was not to restate current law, but rather to make it clear that hidden earmarks have no effect, legal or otherwise.

As my colleagues know, over 95 percent of all earmarks are not even written into our appropriations bills. If we don't fix the language in this resolution we are debating today, all of these earmarks could continue. It is not certain that they will but they could and that is something we should fix to protect American taxpayers.

Our Federal agencies need to understand that hidden earmarks mean nothing and should be completely ignored in their decisionmaking. Our Federal agencies need to spend American tax dollars in ways that meet their core missions and serve true national priorities. Federal agencies should not feel pressure to fund special interest earmarks written by the powerful lawmakers who may cut their funding in retaliation.

Second, the language in H.J. Res. 20 applies to hidden earmarks in the fiscal year 2006 committee reports, but it does not turn off the hidden earmarks buried in committee reports prior to 2006 or those after it. In addition, the language does not turn off earmarks that may be requested through direct communications between lawmakers and our Federal agencies, either by phone or in private emails.

I understand that the Democratic leader is not going to allow any amendments. The Democratic leader scheduled this debate right before the Government's current funding expires so we will all be forced to accept it. This practice has been going on for years, and I am afraid it has become very destructive.

We are going to vote on whether to cut off debate on this measure today at 2:30 p.m. and I will be forced to oppose that motion. Since the Democratic leader has blocked me and other Senators from getting votes on our amendments, I cannot in good conscience vote to cut off debate. My amendment makes small changes to this resolution that would greatly improve its integrity, and there is still time to send this measure back to the House for its approval.

I also want to make it clear that while we have a responsibility in this body to address hidden earmarks in this resolution, the President also has a responsibility to do his part. In a letter that I sent last week, I called on him to instruct his agencies to ignore all earmark requests that do not have the force of law, and I believe he will. He said in the State of the Union Address this year that:

Over 90 percent of earmarks never make it to the floor of the House and Senate—they are dropped into committee reports that are

not even part of the bill that arrives on my desk. You didn't vote them into law. I didn't sign them into law. Yet, they're treated as if they have the force of law. The time has come to end this practice.

It appears as though our Federal agencies are beginning to follow through on the President's directive. Last week, a memo was circulated at the Department of Energy that said:

Because the funding provided by H.J. Res. 20 will not be subject to non-statutory earmarks and the President's policy on earmarks is clear, we must ensure that the Department only funds programs or activities that are meritorious; the Department itself is responsible for making those determinations.

This is a great sign of progress and I hope other agencies will circulate their own memos to this effect. Our agencies have been under the thumb of powerful appropriators for so long, it may be difficult for them to transition to a world without earmarks. But that is what they must do because that is what the American people expect. Americans want their Federal tax dollars to be spent in competitive ways that meet the highest standards. If a project is going to get Federal funding, they expect—just like with a Federal contract—that the money go to the project with the most merit regardless of whose State or district it is in.

We are making great progress on reforming our budget process and reducing earmarks, and I urge my colleagues to help us continue this progress and win back the trust of the American people.

Mr. President, I wish to make a few additional comments about my amendment No. 253 to the fiscal year 2007 omnibus spending bill. This is an amendment that would strengthen a provision in the bill that is under section 112. This gets back to the earmark discussion. The Senate can be proud of the debate and the votes we have taken to disclose earmarks and to eliminate the hidden earmarks that have been added in conference for years. Unfortunately, the language in this omnibus bill continues the status quo. It says that earmarks have no legal effect. It does not take the debate we have all agreed on and make it a prohibition that earmarks cannot be added in conference.

We know that 95 percent of earmarks are in report language. They do not have the force of law. Yet, through intimidation and other ways, Congress has been able to get the executive branch to follow through on these earmarks for years. My amendment would simply go back to what we have already agreed on as a Senate and prohibit these wasteful, hidden earmarks that waste billions of taxpayer dollars every year from being included in report language.

I am encouraged that the White House is responding. We have a memo that the Energy Department sent out last year to its managers telling them not to give preferential treatment to nonbinding, nonlegal congressional earmarks; that earmarks should be

meritorious, as they said in their memo, before they are considered. This would free up all the Federal agencies to focus their spending and their time on Federal priorities, not just specific special interest earmarks that a Member of Congress happens to attach to a bill.

I understand the majority leader is not going to allow any amendments. That is very regrettable, particularly since it leaves out something on which I think we all agree.

The cloture motion we have been asked to vote on at 2:30 is a motion to cut off debate. That means we can no longer talk about the provisions in ways that could improve this bill. For that reason, I am going to have to vote against cloture and hope the majority leader will reconsider, particularly amendments like this which are easy and which this Chamber has already voted unanimously to support.

Mr. President, with that, I yield back.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will stand in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:30 p.m., recessed until 2:14 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. CARPER).

MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2007

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.J. Res. 20, which the clerk will report by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 20) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2007, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Reid Amendment No. 237, to change an effective date.

Reid Amendment No. 238 (to Amendment No. 237), of a technical nature.

Motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations, with instructions to report back forthwith, with Reid Amendment No. 239, to change an effective date.

Reid Amendment No. 240 (to the instructions of the motion to recommit), of a technical nature.

Reid Amendment No. 241 (to Amendment No. 240), of a technical nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 2:30 will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

Who yields time? The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I can do this, I think in 5 or 6 minutes. I yield myself such time as I may consume. Am I recognized?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, today is the 136th day of fiscal year 2007. It is

past time to complete the remaining nine fiscal year 2007 appropriations bills. Agencies have limped along through October, November, December, January, and half of February based on a very restrictive continuing resolution. Thirteen of the fifteen departments do not know how much money they will have for a fiscal year that is now one-third gone, one-third over.

This is a deplorable way to run a government, any government, specifically the Federal Government—this Government.

Under the existing continuing resolution, our veterans hospitals are confronting the need to deny health care to 500,000 veterans and to force 850,000 veterans to wait longer for their care. H.J. Res. 20 includes an increase of \$3.6 billion to solve the problem. On this, the 136th day of fiscal year 2007, it is time to act.

Under the existing continuing resolution, the Social Security Administration is facing longer lines for approving benefits, and furloughs of employees. The 1-800 Medicare call centers, which have received over 35 million calls from the elderly with questions about their coverage, will have to shut down for the final months of the fiscal year. H.J. Res. 20 solves those problems. It is time to act.

Under the existing continuing resolution, the Department of Defense will have to delay elective surgeries, non-emergency care, and increase the cost of some pharmaceuticals for Active-Duty members, their families, and retirees. H.J. Res. 20 includes an increase of \$1.4 billion to solve the problem. It is time to act.

Under the existing continuing resolution, funding for highways and transit is frozen at fiscal year 2006 levels, putting 160,000 jobs at risk. H.J. Res. 20 fully funds the highway and transit guarantees. It is time to act.

Under the existing continuing resolution, no funds are provided to the Department of Defense to build the facilities needed to bring our troops back home from Europe. H.J. Res. 20 includes \$1 billion to solve that problem. It is time, again I say, to act.

According to the White House Office of the Global AIDS Coordinator, under the existing continuing resolution 110,000 to 175,000 people will likely die of HIV-related causes. H.J. Res. 20 includes a \$1.4 billion increase to help HIV victims. It is time to act.

H.J. Res. 20 complies with the \$872.8 billion statutory cap on spending. It contains no earmarks and, I should say, eliminates 9,300 prior earmarks.

Hallelujah. It eliminates 9,300 prior earmarks.

H.J. Res. 20 cuts 125 accounts below fiscal year 2006 levels and freezes 450 accounts at the 2006 level. H.J. Res. 20 is tough, it is disciplined, and it addresses critical needs. It is time to act.

I urge Members to vote aye on the cloture motion and on the resolution.

Mr. President, how much time do we have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has about 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

Under the previous order, the clerk will report the motion to invoke cloture.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close the debate on Calendar No. 18, H.J. Res. 20, Continuing Funding resolution.

Robert C. Byrd, Sherrod Brown, Joe Lieberman, Pat Leahy, Patty Murray, John Kerry, Barbara A. Mikulski, Dick Durbin, Ken Salazar, Jack Reed, Tom Harkin, Dianne Feinstein, H.R. Clinton, Mary Landrieu, Herb Kohl, Carl Levin, Byron L. Dorgan, Ben Nelson.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on H.J. Res. 20, making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2007, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close? The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) are necessarily absent.

Mr. LOTT. The following Senator was necessarily absent. The Senator from Kansas, Mr. BROWNBACK.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 71, nays 26, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 46 Leg.]

YEAS—71

Akaka	Craig	Lieberman
Baucus	Crapo	Lincoln
Bayh	Dodd	Lott
Bennett	Domenici	Lugar
Bingaman	Dorgan	McCaskill
Bond	Durbin	McConnell
Boxer	Enzi	Menendez
Brown	Feingold	Mikulski
Bunning	Feinstein	Murkowski
Burr	Grassley	Murray
Byrd	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Cantwell	Inouye	Nelson (NE)
Cardin	Isakson	Obama
Carper	Kennedy	Pryor
Casey	Kerry	Reed
Chambliss	Klobuchar	Reid
Clinton	Kohl	Rockefeller
Cochran	Landrieu	Salazar
Coleman	Lautenberg	Sanders
Conrad	Leahy	Schumer
Corker	Levin	Shelby

Specter
Stabenow
Sununu

Tester
Thune
Vitter

Webb
Whitehouse

NAYS—26

Alexander
Allard
Coburn
Collins
Cornyn
DeMint
Dole
Ensign
Graham

Gregg
Hagel
Hatch
Hutchison
Inhofe
Kyl
Martinez
McCain
Roberts

Sessions
Smith
Snowe
Stevens
Thomas
Voinovich
Warner
Wyden

NOT VOTING—3

Biden Brownback Johnson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 71, the nays are 26. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. DURBIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

RELATIVE TO THE DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE CHARLES W. NORWOOD, JR., OF GEORGIA

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 79, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 79) relative to the death of Representative Charles W. Norwood, Jr., of Georgia.

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Honorable Charles W. Norwood, Jr., late a Representative from the State of Georgia.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the Senate adjourns or recesses today, it stand adjourned or recessed as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 79) was agreed to.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator CHAMBLISS and I, from Georgia, be recognized for a few minutes to pay tribute to Representative NORWOOD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, first of all, I thank Leader REID and Leader MCCONNELL for bringing this resolution